DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 869 FL 024 431

AUTHOR Yumoto, Kazuko
TITLE From Formulaic Speech to Creative Speech.
PUB DATE Mar 92
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Language; Discourse Analysis; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Japanese; *Language Acquisition; *Language Patterns; *Language Processing; Learning Processes; Second Language Learning

ABSTRACT

A study of second language acquisition focuses on the transition from formulaic to creative speech patterns. Subjects were two native Japanese-speaking children, aged 4 and 8, learning English as a Second Language in New York, observed over a period of 2 years. The nature of formulaic speech is discussed, drawing from research on such speech and its common use in child language. Several explanations of the relationship of formulaic to creative speech is examined, concluding that routines of speech evolve into patterns, then eventually into creative speech. A process by which unanalyzed speech routines are segmented and combined with parts of other routines, thus evolving into patterns, is proposed, referring in particular to high-frequency formulas in the early language learning stages: self-assertion, imperative, demand, "I know," and "wh"-question formulas. It is suggested that this formula-based analysis leads to creative speech in dialogues in which unconscious pattern practices and substitution exercises play important roles. It is concluded that abundant use of formulaic speech in early acquisition stages reduces the learning burden while maximizing communicative capability, and progressive differentiation of formulas helps the learner build the rule system of the language. Contains 10 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 404 869

From Formulaic Speech to Creative Speech

Kazuko Yumoto

I. Introduction

Many studies on language acquisition claim that formulaic speech plays an important role in the early stage of language learning. This is the case not only with the first language but also with the second.

The objective of this study is: (1) to describe formulaic speech; (2) to examine different views of the relationship between formulaic speech and creative speech; (3) to demonstrate the developmental stages from formulaic speech to creative speech based on the observation of two Japanese children acquiring English in natural setting.

The subjects of the study were 4 year old and 8 year old. Their acquisition of English was observed in New York over the period of two and a half years. The data were collected by taking notes of their spontaneous speech, some of which were tape recorded. The analysis here is based on the data collected from the notes.

II. The Nature of Formulaic Speech

One of the most striking features of children acquiring language is that they take a so-called gestalt approach to language; that is, they absorb a whole utterance as a chunk as if it were a single unit, as in 'Whacha doing ?' (N 0.8).

Formulaic speech refers to a language consisting of fixed, stereotyped expressions which are learned as chunks or unanalyzed wholes. They are learned through rote memorization, and are thus automatic units. Formulaic speech is very common in language acquisition, particulary in the early stage of acquisition. Reports on formulaic speech are abundant in literature though terminology may be different: gestalt speech (Peters 1977), prefabricated routines (Brown 1973, Hakuta 1974), prepackaged patterns (Clarks 1974), routines and patterns (Krashen and Scarcella 1978, Ellis 1985), canned speech (Hatch 1983), and conventionalized forms (Yorio 1980).

1. The number in parentheses refers to the time elapsed (year, month) since the subject was exposed to English. N refers to 4 year old and M, 8 year old. The meaning and / or context of the utterance are added if necessary.

FL024431

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kazuko Yumoto
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

From Formulaic Speech to Creative Speech

Peters (1977) distinguishes "analytic" from "gestalt" speech in the first language development; "analytic, clear, one-word-at a time speech is used in referential contexts. Gestalt speech, on the other hand, is the attempt to use whole utterances in a socially appropriate situation; it is thus used in more conversationally defined contexts" (Peters 566). Peters' subject seems to aim at producing whole sentences: "He seems to have tried to approximate the general gestalt of his target sentence, aiming at such features as number of syllables, intonation as well as certain key segments." (Peters 1977, 566).

Peters' distinction of analytic and gestalt is also shared by other researchers such as Nelson's "referential" versus "expressive" style (1975), Dore's "word development" versus "prosodic development" (1974) and Hatch's "rule formers" versus "data gatherers" (1974).

Types of formulaic speech include routines and patterns. Researchers distinguish between prefabricated routines and patterns (Brown 1973, Hakuta 1974, Krashen and Scarcella 1978). Prefabricated routines refer to whole utterances or phrases learned as memorized chunks (Krashen and Scarcella, 283) such as 'How are you ?' (N 0.6) or 'What time is it now ?' (N 0.6). Prefabricated routines are unanalyzed wholes and are used without any knowledge of their internal structure (Krashen and Scarcella, 283). Prefabricated patterns refer to utterances that consist of "partly memorized wholes and an open slot for a movable component" (Hakuta 1974, 283), such as 'It's _____.'(mine, my bed) (N 0.6, 0.7) or 'Where's_____?' (cup, pencil) (N 0.7). These are partly creative and partly memorized wholes (Krashen and Scarcella 1978, 283). Lyons called such structures "sentence-schemata" as opposed to "ready-made utterances" (1969, 178). He defined the latter as "complete utterances which permit no extension or variation" and the former as utterances "which are grammatically unstructured, or only partially structured, but which can yet be combined in sentences according to productive rules" (177-178).

There seems to be agreement as to the explanation of the abundant use of formulaic speech as a strategy of language learning in the early stage. Children need to establish a social relation with their peer group. Language functions to strengthen such social ties.

In naturalistic second language acquisition, to meet such basic communicative needs is especially acute (Ellis 168). It has been suggested that children "with advanced semantic development and yet no form with which to express such thoughts" (Hakuta 288) develop formulaic speech as "an immediate response to communicative pressure" (Ellis 168). Routine-responses such as 'I did it'(N 0.4), 'I can do it' (N 0.5) or 'Let me see' (N 0.8) function as a communication smoother. Children memorize a number of ready-

made expressions such as 'More milk, please' (N 0.6), 'I want fork, please' (N 0.5), or 'I wanna eat' (N 0.7) and use them to "compensate for lack of sufficient L2 (second language) rules to construct creative speech" (Ellis, 168).

A heavy use of ready-made formulas by children can also be explained in terms of linguistic input. Input to children is filled with formulaic expressions. Input to children is generally simple as well as concrete and limited to events in the immediate perceptual field (Hatch 1978). Consequently, it is easy for children to figure out what is being said and to memorize and reproduce those overused formulas such as; 'Where you going ?' (N 0.5), 'Whacha doing ?' (N 0.7, M 0.8), 'What's this ?' (M 0.7), 'Who's this ?' (N 0.6) 'How are you ?' (N 0.7), 'How old are you ?' (N 0.7), 'Where dija get it ?' (M 0.7) or 'Why don't you stop ?' (M 0.7).

Daily interactions with friends and teachers at play and at work enable children to induce meaning adequately, as in; 'Move !' (N 0.4, M 0.7), 'Go raway/a way !' (M 0.5), 'Come over here' (N 0.5, M 0.7), 'Give it to me' (N 0.6), 'Furry up !' (M 0.6), 'Hurry up, please' (N 0.7), 'Get down' (N 0.7), 'Get out of here' (M 0.7), 'Sit down' (M 0.7) 'You /I go first' (M 0.5), 'I like this glass' (N 0.6), 'It's mine' (N 0.6), 'That's not mine' (N 0.6), 'This is my ball' (N 0.6), '"Play with me ?" "No"' (N 0.6), 'Everybody, six dollars please' (N 0.6), 'Everybody look, this Star Wars' (M 0.7) 'Jiju/Diju see that ?' (N 0.7) or 'Are you all right ?' (N 0.8)

Classroom language is highly predictable since teachers repeatedly use routines with minor variations. Children are quick to pick up classroom expressions such as 'All righ guys, come here' (N 0.6), 'I told you no more questions' (N 0.7), 'No more talking' (N 0.7) or 'Everybody, going home' (N 0.7).

Even if children are not successful enough in inducing meaning out of extra-linguistic context, they memorize precisely the whole formula and ask its meaning later, as in; '"I want you to sit down" *te nani* ?' (N 0.7), '"I so gla (d)" *te nani* ?' (N 0.8) or '"mistake" *te nani* ? Did I do mistake ?' (N 1.3) (What is ~ ?")

To summarize, researchers agree as to the status of formulaic speech and the reasons for its common use in child language, as Wong-Fillmore put it, "the child makes the greatest use of what he has learned, and in the early part of the acquisition period, what he has learned is largely formulaic" (1976, 654).

Ⅲ. Formulaic Speech and Creative Speech

There are two conflicting views as to the relationship of formulaic speech to creative speech, namely, whether or not formulaic speech is directly related to language acquisition. One position is to assume that since formulaic speech consists of automatically memorized units, it does not lead to analytic creative language (Krashen and Scarcella 1978, Wagner-Gough 1975, Nishihori 1984). The other position is to assume that formulaic speech evolves into creating language systems (Clark 1974, Fillmore 1976, McLaughlin et al. 1978, Ellis 1984).

Krashen and Scarcella (1978, 284) pose the following three positions in this regard:

1. Prefabricated routines may evolve into prefabricated patterns. According to this position, purely propositional language does not exist and performers rely solely on patterns and routines to communicate.
2. Prefabricated routines may evolve into patterns, but at the same time, independently, the creative construction process develops. This implies that in some situations propositional language may "catch up" with automatic speech; that is, the language acquisition process may "reanalyze" patterns and routines as creative constructions.
3. Prefabricated routines may evolve into prefabricated patterns, (as in position one), and these patterns may evolve directly into creative language. In other words routines and patterns may be ingredients of the creative process.

Position 1 seems to be the case of adult learners of a second language who have trained in mechanical repetition and memorization of sentence pattern practice and who are not successful enough in attaining linguistic competence. What we are concerned with in the present study are positions 2 and 3. The difference between the two is that in position 2 fomulaic speech (routines and patterns) and creative language are considered to be unrelated while in position 3 they are related.

Krashen and Scarcella seem to suggest that there is a dichotomy between automatic/formulaic speech and creative/propositional language. That is, formulaic speech and the process of "creative constructions" of language rules are considered by them to be entirely separate. They say that "patterns and routines may develop due to high frequency in input in advance of lingusitic maturity, but such automatic speech is independent of the creative

construction process; it may fall away in some situations and be re-analyzed by the language acquisition process" (287). It seems that in their view routines and patterns lack creative aspects of language learning and that they are dependent solely on the mechanism called "the creative construction process" or "the language acquisition process." Their "creative construction process" seems to echo Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device (LAD). However, they do not offer any explanation about it in detail nor do they explain how it triggers "creative rule-governed language" (292).

Wagner-Gough also maintains that formulaic speech and creative speech are not related. She has noted that her subject relies heavily on routines and patterns to communicate, and conclude that patterns do not directly evolve into creative language: "It is quite clear that there is no transfer between some imitations and subsequent free speech patterns. For example, a learner may say 'My name is Homer,' in one breath and 'He Fred' in another. The former being a memorized pattern and the latter the learner's own rule" (1975, 71).

Fillmore, on the other hand, takes the opposite view, standing strongly on position 3 above. She suggests that formulas which are first understood and used by children as wholes are gradually broken into segments and used in various slots. This segmentation of routines itself is an analytical process. She argues (1976) that:

> "... the strategy of acquiring formulaic speech is central to the learning of language: indeed, it is this step that puts the learner in a position to perform the analysis which is prerequisite to acquisition. The formulas ... constituted the linguistic material on which a large part of their (the children's analytical activities) could be compared with other utterances in the repertory as well as with those produced by other speakers" (640) ... "larger units were broken into smaller units, routines became patterns, and parts of patterns were "freed" to recombine with other parts of patterns. This break-up of routines and patterns provided the basis for syntax, while morphology appeared much later" (656).

Grammatical rules seem to be constructed when all the consituents of a formula are "freed". She says that "in the development of productive structure, the children all seemed to be following the strategy of working the major constituents first and dealing with the grammatical details later..." (656).

Ellis, who also stands on position 3, accounts for this process as "a strategy of pattern analysis": "This works by comparing formulas and looking for similarities and differences. It ascribes to the learner something of the skills of a linguist seeking to identify the constituent structures of utterances" (1985 170). He shows such process in the 'I don't know' formula. The formula is broken down into constituents by a child so that 'don't' is used in other expressions as in, 'I don't like/understand.' The "freed" constituent 'know' occurs without the negative constituent as in, 'I know this'; then subjects other than 'I' begin to appear, 'You don't know where it is'. Ellis concludes that "formulas are slowly unpackaged so that valuable information can be fed into the creative rule system" (169).

A similar "route of unpackaging" was observed by Kawauchi (1990, 89). She says that there are four stages of unpackaging 'I don't know' formula: 1. 'I don't' is combined with other formulas, as in 'I don't need it'; 2. 'I don't + Verb' in "slot" strategy is employed with 'any' attached, as in, 'I don't see any car'; 3. 'Subjects other than 'I' are used, as in '... we don't have no more'; and 4. '(don't) know' is combined with other formulas in embedded clauses, as in 'You don't know how to do it.' (89-90). Her data suggest "a dynamic interplay between grammar and lexicon" (93).

On the basis of the data from our longitudinal study, we take the position that routines evolve into patterns, and that formulaic speech eventually evolves into creative speech. We would like to present evidence to support this position, or what Fillmore calls "the formula-based analytical process", by looking into the process of how unanalyzed formulas are broken down into morphemic units in child language. In the next section we will specifically analyze the development of the most frequent formulas.

IV. Formula-based Analytical Process

A. From Routines to Patterns

There are abundant routines and patterns in the environment surrounding children. Recurrent linguistic items in input draw children's attention in the very initial stage. Apparently, children pick up those recurrent segments of speech and put them into maximum use. The language used at play is most important for children's lives. Communicative pressure is especially strong in the case of second language acquisition. Language functions as a passport to the peer group of the target language. Routines provide children with instant means of communicating with playmates.

Routines picked up from playmates are practiced in monologue when playing alone

at home as in, 'I did it' (N 0.4), 'I can do it' (N 0.5) or 'Everybody, six dollars please' (N 0.6). Sometimes the whole script between friends is practiced in monologue as in 'Play with me?', 'No.' (N 0.6).

Unanalyzed routines are segmented and combined with parts of other routines. In this way routines evolve into patterns. We will discuss this process referring to high frequency formulas in the early stage.

1. Self-assertion Formulas

Self-assertion routines such as 'It's/That's/This is mine', for instance, are quite common in children's conversations, and are acquired in the earliest period of learning.

It's mine. N 0.6

The routine is broken down, so that 'It's' is used with other constituents to fill the slot in the 'It's_____' pattern:

It's my bed. N 0.7
It's my cat. N 0.6, N 0.8
It's my turn. N 0.8
It's dinner time. M 0.7
It's good. N 0.7

'It's' is used with a negative marker, 'not':

It's not finish. M 0.7

'That's' is also used with fillers of the 'It's_____' pattern:

That's yours. N 0.6
That's mine. M 0.8
That's your track. N 0.8
That's a big kiss. N 0.6
That's teddy bear's house. N 0.7
That's good. M 0.8

'That's' pattern is also used with the negative marker:

That's not mine. N 0.6

The pattern is further broken down, so that 'that' is taken out to combine with other patterns, or incorporated into structures:

Jiju see that? Diju see that? N 0.7
Did you see that? M 0.8
This way or that way? (Are we going this way or that way?) N 0.7
Where's the key? That door. (Where's the key to that door?) N 0.7
Give me that. M 1.2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

'This is' pattern is also used with other fillers of formulas:

This is my ball. N 0.6
This is my cat. N 0.6
This is my paper. N 0.8
This is my car. N 0.9
This is a teddy bear. M 0.8
This is teddy bear's hat. M 0.8

'This is ' pattern is combined with other patterns:

This is tasty good. N 0.8

The utterance is most likely a mixture of two patterns, namely, 'This is tasty' and 'This tastes good.'

The pattern is segmented, so that 'this' is used with other patterns:

Who's this ? Tell. (Tell me who this is.) N 0.6
I know how ... go like this, go like this, go like this. N 0.7
How much is it, this ? (How much is this ?) N 0.8

The routine 'How much is it ? ' is a memorized whole, thus producing a redundant structure.

Why don't you go this way ? N 0.8
Oh, I know this. N 1.2

2. Imperative Formulas

Command expressions are abundant in child language. The routines of imperatives such as 'Don't/Move ! ' are acquired in the initial stage of learning.

a. 'Move (+NP)' formula

Move ! (I want you to move.) N 0.4, M 0.8

The routine is combined with other routines or incorporated in structure:

I ca' move. I ca'n. (I can't move. I can't.) N 0.8 (The negative marker is expressed by the long vowel [æ :].)
No, move more. More move. N 1.2

The routine "Move ! ' is expanded to the pattern, 'Move + NP'.

Get out of me ! Nobu, move ! Move ! Move your heet. Move your feet. M 0.8
Move it this. Move it, please. N 1.3

Since 'Move it' is memorized as an unanalyzed whole, a redundant structure such as 'Move it this' is used even in the 15 th month of residence.

b. 'Don't (+ VP) ' formula

Prohibition is first expressed by routines:

Don't. N 0.3
No. N 0.3

The routines evolve into the pattern, 'Don't + VP'.

(1) Don't + VP

The routines are combined with other formulas:

Negative imperatives are numerous in number in child language.

Don't touch radio. N 0.6
No, don't push me. N 0.8
Don't book story. (He might have meant "Don't read a story book." In the library) N 0.8
Don't say it. N 0.8
Don't pick your nose. N 0.8
Don't kick my face. M 0.8
Don't touch here. N 0.8
Don't pull me ! Don't push me and don't pull me and don't hit me.
Don't hit me (a)gain. M 0.10

'Don't' was broken down by M into 'do not'.

Noby, smile. Do not like that. M 0.11

(2) 'don't / don' incorporated into structure

The negative imperative formula is incorporated into structure:

I don't wanna water. M 0.8
I don't wanna mustard. N 0.8
I don wanna salad. (I don't want lettus.) N 0.8
But he don eat peoples, he only eats a food. (The warm did not eat people but it eats only our food.) N 1.2
We don't any book read ? (Don't we read any book ?) N 1.1

(3) 'don't + VP' combined with other formulas

I told you to don't touch it, Nobu ! M 1.5

The negative imperative formula is incorporated into a structure, in which the child simply combined the 'don't + VP' formula with another familiar formula 'I told you to + V'. The utterance is built up by the strategy of juxtaposition and is considered to be one instance of interlanguage structure. The generated structure was not refined yet in that the negative imperative transformation was not applied in the embedded clause. However, the developmental process of the 'don't' formula exemplifies one aspect of a child's creating a target structure.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Demand Formulas

Linguistic input to children is filled with routines and patterns, such as 'Give it to me', 'Give me + NP' and 'I wanna + NP' formulas. Demand formulas are central to child language and are picked up in the earliest stage of learning. It is easy for children to take the 'Give me' pattern out of input and to make best use of it by alternating fillers from their repertory into the slot.

a. 'Give me (+ NP)' formula

Give me ! 'Give me ! I got two. M 0.7

(1) 'Give me + NP' formula

The routine, 'Give me' evolves into the pattern, 'Give me + NP'.

Hey Noby, give me the pen. (give me a pen) M 0.7.
Give me a napkin. N 0.6
Give me a towel ! N 0.7
Give me a chair. N 0.7
Give me a cat. M 0.8
Give me a cat, Mommy. N 0.8
Give me a teddy bear. N 0.8
Give me my teddy bear. N 0.8
Give me my papper. N 0.8
Give me hands. N 0.8 (Help me with your hands.)
Give me ears. N 0.8 (Lend me your ears.)

(2) 'Give me + Pro N' formula

Give me it. M 0.7, 0.8
Give me that. M 1.4

The next stage is that by analogy the NP in the first formula is replaced by the pronoun 'it' to generate 'Give me it', which pattern is stubbornly kept in spite of frequent corrections up to a period of a year. It is probably because this is an interlanguage structure of 'give it to me' form in the child's developing rule system. Note that the correct form appears in the same month: 'Give it to me' (M 0.7, N 0.8). Up to the eighth month, N had used 'Give me it'.

(3) 'Give it to me (+ Juncture) + NP' formula

The 'Give me + NP' formula yields to the pattern 'Give it to me + NP' in the next stage of development. It is probably because the overused routine, 'Give it to me', is understood by children as an unanalyzed whole, and that lexical items at hand are picked up to fill in the object slot. This is another instance of developmental interlanguage structure of the 'give me + NP' form. This supports the notion that routines evolve into

patterns as a creative process. The routine 'Give it to me' may or may not be followed by a juncture.

Give it to me. M 0.7, N 0.8
Give it to me my teddy bear. N, M 0.8
Give it to me, my paper. M 0.8
Give it to me the cat. N 0.8
Give it to me the car. N, M 0.8
Give it to me the Coke ! Give it to me the Cola. N 0.8
Give it to me the orange juice. N 0.8

(4) 'Give me + NP' formula

The 'Give it to me + NP' formula was broken down and reanalyzed by the children. The 'Give me + NP' formulas is finally stabilized as the final stage.

Give me my paper. N 0.11

(5) 'give + NP' incorporated into structure or combined with other formulas.

Daddy gives me this. N 1.9
I give you a present you like. N 1.11
I'll give you one more five kisses. N 1.11
Could you give me *oyatsu* ? N 1.11

b. 'I wanna/want' formula

This is another favorite formula commonly used by the children. It is interesting to notice that the children seem to follow different routes of unpackaging the formula. M initially acquired the 'I wanna + NP' formula, as in, 'I wanna play ball.' The formula, 'I wanna', was then broken down into 'I want to' in the next step as in, 'I want to go in the car'. Simultaneously, 'want' was released from the formula to take NP, as in, 'I want you, Nobu.' N seemed to follow the other way around; N picked up the 'I want + NP' formula first, then the 'I wanna + VP/NP' formula. Note that the 'I wanna' formula' takes NP as well in N's speech as in, 'I wanna *oekaki/oshokuji/*cake.' N further underwent a period, the 'I want to + VP' formula as the final stage as in, 'I want to talk something to you'.

(1) 'I want + NP' formula

I want fork, please. N 0.6
I want this pencil. (a pencil) N 0.6
I want some one more. (some more) N 0.6
I want *oekaki*. (I want to draw.) N 0.8
I want pee pee. I want pee pee doing. N 0.8

I want to go to bathroom. (Repeating the corrected form) N 0.8
I want to go to bathtub. (I want to go to bathroom.) N 0.8
I want towel, please. N 0.8
Nobu, I want you. *Koiyo* ! (Come over here.) M 0.8
I want to go in the car ! (I want to get into the car.) M 0.9

(2) 'I wanna + VP/NP' formula

I wanna go to swim. N 0.7
I wanna play ball. M 0.7
I wanna *oshokuji*. N 0.8
'I wanna eat' *dayo*. (It should be 'I wanna eat'.) M 0.8
I wanna et you, Machan. (I wanna hit you.) N 0.8

The negative marker, 'don't' is combined with the 'I wanna' formula to create still another formula, 'I don'(t) wanna' + NP.

I don't wanna water. N 0.8
I don't wanna mustard. N 0.8
I don't wanna salad. N 0.8
I don't wanna anymore. N 1.3

The auxiliary 'do' was combined with the formula:

Hey Jono, do you wanna take a short cut ? M 1.1

(3) 'I (don't) want to + VP' formula

The 'I (don't) wanna + VP' formula was rearranged by the child. In this way the original formula used in the first stage was revived.

I want to talk something to you. N 1.3
I don't want to eat anymore.
I don't want to eat bread, Moma.
I don't like to eat bread. N 1.4

Here, 'I don't want to' formula was instantly paraphrased by the other pattern with similar meaning, 'I don't like to + Verb'.

(4) 'I want to + VP'/'I want + NP' combined with other formulas in embeded clauses

I want to be a teacher when I grow up. N 1.5
I want the pajama that has signs. (With traffic signs printed) N 1.7
I want motel that has a slide. N 1.8

The utterances reflect child's linguistic competence in that relative transformation is applied to the embedded clauses.

4. 'I know' Formula

(1) 'I (don't) know (+ NP)' formula

I know how ... go like this, go like this. (I know how to fold the paper.) N 0.7
Oh, I know this. N 1.2

(2) 'I/You (don't) know' combined with other formulas in embedded clauses

I know how to spell hippopotamus. M 1.2
I know how to make good puppets. M 1.4
You don't know how to eat. M 1.2
I know what shall I do. (I know what I should do.) N 1.4
I know what I can do. N 1.5

The two memorized formulas are simply combined without the SV inversion in the last two utterances. The subject and the verb are inverted when the latter is the be copula as in the following sentences.

You know what dumb is. N 1.3
You don't know where my house is. M 1.11

(3) 'You know + NP ?' without Aux.'Do'

The 'You know' formula without the auxiliary 'do' is used as an interrogative sentence with a rising intonation contour.

You know why ? M 0.8

(4) 'Do you know (+ NP) ?' formula

The auxiliary 'do' is employed in the interrogative structure.

Do you know egg ? N 0.7
Do you know she's name ? N 1.8

For sometime 'she's', 'subjective Pro N + /z/' is used as the substitution for 'her'. This is probably an overgeneralization of the possessive form. The child does not seem to differentiate the homophonous 'he's' from 'his'.

What my favorite number is ? Do you know ? N 1.4
Do you know one more favorite number is ? (Do you know what my other favorite number is ?) N 1.4

The two formulas are said one after another in the first utterance: The wh-question functions as an object of the following formula, 'Do you know ?' The two utterances could be a step to the next stage in which the 'Do you know + NP' formula is used with other formulas in embedded clauses.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(5) 'Do you know + NP' with other formulas in embedded clauses

Do you know Miss Headley lives ? (Do you know where Miss Headley lives ?) N 1.5

The embedded clause without an interrogative pronoun may be understood as an inter-language structure of 'Do you know + NP' formula in embedded clauses.

Do you know what's in here is. N 1.3

The redundant structure reveals that the child understood and used formulas as unanalyzed chunks i.e. "What's in here ? ' and 'Here is'

Do you know what can I do ? N 1.5

The two formulas are simply juxtaposed without SV inversion because 'what can I do' is a memorized whole.

Do you know what I'n gora get ? (Do you know what I'm going to get ?) . N 1.4
Do you know where you can get them. N 1.11
Do you know how this maze goes. N 1.2
Do you know where it is ? N 1.11
Do you know where I went to the vacation ? (Do you know where I went during the vacation ?) N 1.4
Do you know what I'll give you today ? N 1.5

Embedded clauses fluctuate at this period from complete structures to redundant structures.

5. 'Wh-question' Formula

In closing section A, we will focus on the developmental process from routines to patterns. We will analyze development of wh-questions specifically in M's speech.

(1) 'Where's/What's/Who's + NP ? ' formula

Interrogative questions with an abbreviated form of the be copula such as 'where's', 'what's and 'who's' formulas are in the intial stage understood and used as unanalyzed wholes in the child.

Where's you, Nobu ? (Where are you, Nobu ?) 0.5
What's dinner today ? 0.6
Excuse me, what's this ? 0.7

(2) 'Where/What/Who + be +NP' formula

The forms that the child initially understood as unanalyzed wholes were broken down into two constituents, an interrogative pronoun and the be copula.

Who's-- who were you ? . (Who are you ?) 0.8

In this stage, however, the complex English copula forms had not yet been acquired; the child was searching for the right form in the middle of the utterance. Comparing this utterance with the previous one, 'Where's you, Nobu ? ', we can see that the child in the first stage did not notice the error. In this stage he came to recognize the error, tried to correct it, and restated the utterance, though he chose the inappropriate copula. He was beginning to monitor his speech. Another example of this sort in a different construction, 'Who + VP ? ', took the following route:

(1) 'Who + V ? ' without third-sing. (-s)

Who's like, who like 7 Up ? Who want Coca Cola ? (Who likes 7 Up ?) 0.7

The child initially understood the constituent 'who's' as a monomorpheme, thus uttering the phrase 'who's like' automatically. However, no sooner had he produced the utterance than he noticed the error and corrected himself, though he omitted the third person singular (-s).

(2) 'Who + V ? ' with third-sing. (-s)

The third person singular (-s), omitted initially, made its appearance a little later in this stage:

Who wants play golf ? (Who wants to play golf ?) 0.7
Who wants go upstairs ? (Who wants to go upstairs ?) 0.7
Who goes first ? 0.7

The development of present progressive structures can be seen as follows. At first 'Where you' and 'What you' formulas appear without copula:

(1) 'Where/What + you' ? ' without copula

What you doing ? 0.9
Where you going ? 1.2
What I eating ? 1.1

(2) 'Whacha + V-ing' formula

Then 'Whacha' formula emerged:

Whacha doing ? 0.8

(3) 'Whachu you + V-ing' formula

The child came to notice some segments in the formula. As a consequence, the chunk, 'Whacha' is divided into, 'Whachu you':

Whachu you doing ? 0.8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(4) 'Whachu you + V-ing' formula

In the next step 'Whachu' was further broken into 'What chu you'. The constituent 'chu' seems to function as a be copula in the childs grammar.

What chu you doing up there ? 0.10

Notice 'are' appeared as in , 'What are you say ? ' (0.5) or 'What are they doing, are they ? ' (0.7) in which be copula is coordinated with the subject.

However, the 'What chu' formula is so strong that the constituents are not easily broken up.

'Wh-questions + did' or 'do' follows the route that first the auxiliary verbs 'did' and 'do' were not differentiated from be copula:

(1) 'Wh-Pro N + are you ? ' formula

What are you say ? (What did you say ?) 0.5
What do you doing, Noby ? 1.1

(2) 'Wh-Pro N + dija ? ' formula

An analyzed chunk of auxiliary 'dija' (did you) emerged in the next step:

Where dija get it ? 0.7

(3) 'Wh-Pro N + did you ? ' formula

The form 'dija' was then analyzed into the constituents 'did' and 'you' :

Yack ! Did you see that ? 0.8
Did you hear me ? Now what I did ? What did I say ? 1.2
How many friends did you have ? ... do you have ? 1.10

'Why don't you /How do you know/ + VP' formulas were learned in the early stage as complete structures:

Why don't you stop ? 0.7
Why don't you do like this ? 0.9
How do you know where I'm hiding ? 1.2

Other utterances to note:

Where rubber band gone ? 0.7
What month do you have birthday ? March ? February ? 1.3
How much do I have to spend ? 1.3

The first utterance may represent a proto form of the present perfect formula. The second utterance is unique in that the child creatively constructed the structure in his own way.

Having observed how the children manupulate routines and patterns, we may conclude that the children gradually notice variations in formulaic structures and recognize constituents: routines are broken into segments. Recurrent segments stay in child's mind as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

patterned frames. Other constituents are taken out as movable units to fill in patterns other than the original ones. Analyzed formulas are reanalyzed or rearranged, if necessary, in order to adjust the rule system that the children have created to fit the input data. In this way routines evolve into patterns which consist of memorized frames plus creative open slots. In the process of comparing similarities and differences in formulaic speech, the children gradually develop a target language system. Formulas and the subsequent breaking up process lead to creative speech.

B. From Formulas to Creative Speech

In the previous section we have observed how routines may evolve into patterns, i.e. routines are combined with other routines thus creating a new formula. In this section we will observe how formula-based analysis leads to creative speech in some dialogues in which unconscious pattern practices and substitution exercises play important roles in the initial stage of second language acquisition.

N often practiced acquired utterances in monologue while playing alone. His pattern practices and subsequent substitution exercises with lexical items in repertory seemed to be useful tactics or strategies for second language learning. The following dialogues show some of these sentence pattern practices and substitution exercises unconsciously employed by the child.

> 'Walk' *wa aruku desho*? *Hashiru wa* 'wun' *desho*. A cat is walk. A dog is walk. ("Walk" means to walk, doesn't it? "Run" means to run, doesn't it? A cat is running. A dog is walking.) N 0.5

The first two sentences in the monologue above were produced as if the child was making sure of himself. The rest of the monologue was uttered as if the child was enjoying sentence pattern practices using aural-oral method techniques. The whole utterance may be understood as metaawareness of language.

Even in the presence of others the child was sometimes lost in monologue. The following dialogue took place while N was having a snack in the kitchen. He was putting on a mitten with the face of a pussy cat.

> N: What a beautiful cat!
> Mom: *Dore ga*? (Which one?)
> N: *Kore da yo*. (This one.)
> What a beautiful cat. (again to himself as juice spills on the mitten)
> It's wet. What a dirty cat! 0.8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the dialogue the child very much absorbed in the cat-shaped mitten, a cat being his favorite animal. The exclamatory formula was spontaneously subtituted by other filler appropriate to the situation.

The child frequently imitated the teacher's instructions when playing alone as in , 'All righ guys, come here' (0.6) or while eating dinner he suddenly said, 'Everybody going home ! ' (0.7). The following dialogue is another example of this sort in which the child is practicing patterns acquired from a teacher while playing with cars with his brother.

N: I told you no more questions.	(in a loud monologue)
M: *Do yu imi* ?	(M could not comprehend N's abrupt utterance, totally unrelated to the situation.)
N: *Sensei ga ite ita yo.* "No more talking."	(The teacher said so.) (Then repeated the phrase once again as if to practice the sentence pattern.) 0.8

The child frequently asked for meanings of highly frequent formulas picked up at school. The following dialogue also reflects what the teacher said to children during class activities. The child asked his mother:

'I want you to sit down' *te nani* ? (What does 'I want you to sit down' mean ?)

No sooner had he understood the meaning than he practiced the formula with substition in monologue:

I want you to lie down. 0.8

In another occasion he asked about the other formula:

N: 'I so gla' *te nani* ?	(What is 'I so glad' ?)
Mom. 'I'm so glad' *te 'ureshii' te koto yo.* I'm so glad if you go to bed now. *'Nenne shitara ureshii wa' teitta no yo.*	(It means that 'I'm so glad.' I'm so glad if you would go to bed now.")
N: *Iyada.* I so glad sleeping with mommy.	(No, I won't. I'm so glad if I could sleep with you.) 0.9

In the dialogue the child skillfully manipulated the formula by putting the most fitting lexical items into the substitution slot. This exemplifies how children are creative in building up new structures out of finite formulas.

In the following dialogue, the child transferred lexical items from his first language to compensate for the lack of items available to him in the target language. This transfer of language is quite common in N's speech.

N: I wanna *o-shoukuji.*
M: 'I wanna eat' *da yo.* (It should be 'I want to eat.')

N: I wanna eat you, Machan. 0.8

Responding to the correction made by his brother, the child made fun of him using the acquired formula in modified form. This is another example which shows child's structural creativity based on formulas.

The child was so absorbed in his ego-centric world that he abruptly started dialogues which are very often unrelated to the context:

N: How are you, Mommy ?
Mom: Fine, thank you, and you ?
N: *Chigau yo.* 'How old are you ?' *da yo.* (That's not what I mean. I mean 'How old are you ?')
Mom: I'm thirty six
N: How old are you daddy ? (How old is daddy ?)
Mom: 'How old is daddy ?' *de sho* ? (That is "How old is daddy ?")
N: How old is daddy ?
Mom: He's forty one. 0.8

The dialogue took place at lunch. The child abruptly posed a formulaic question, which was assumed by the mother to be one of his favorite pattern practice exercises. However, her answer failed to satisfy him. He realized that he had made an error and corrected the error by posing another common formulaic question. He was eager enough to apply the pattern for further exploration. The formula was understood as a whole by the child thus producing 'How old are you daddy ?' by means of juxtaposition strategy.

The child can quite easily get in and get out of dialogues and back again to monologues and practice sentence patterns and pattern substitutions. Such practices and exercises are in most cases unconscious behaviours. Formulaic patterns are exercised as if the child is playing with the target language.

From this observation we may conclude that the pattern analysis observed here is a kind of creative activity. The child constructs an analytical creative language system based on formulas and upon that system the child builds up and expands structures. Thus, formulaic speech serves as the basis for creative speech.

V. Conclusion

The objective of this study is to describe the nature of formulaic speech and to examine different views of the relationship between formulaic speech and creative speech.

We have found that highly frequent patterns are memorized and imitated by children as an initial strategy of learning language. The abundant use of formulas in the initial

stage is because formulaic speech "reduces the learning burden while maximizing communicative ability" (Ellis, 168). Comparing utterances, children gradually recognize which parts recur and which parts remain stable, i.e. formulas once memorized as wholes are gradually submitted to an analytical process that releases constituents to be used in slots in other formulas. Through the progressive differentiation of formulas children step by step built up a rule system of the language. That is, formulaic speech serves as the core of language acquisition which induces rule-created speech. Formulas are, therefore, bases on which to develop communicative competence.

From the observation of our data we may draw the conclusion that formula-based speech leads to creative speech. However, this observation is based on a limited number of formulas, so analytical processing from formulas to rule governed language is still open to further study.

Note

This is a revised version of a paper presented at the 29 th Annual Conference of JACET hosted by Kanda University for International Studies (Kanda Gaigo Daigaku), September, 8, 1990.

References

Brown, R. A. 1973 First Language. Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press.
Clark, R. 1974. "Performing without Competence." Journal of Child Language 1 : 1-10.
Ellis, R. 1985. Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford University Press.
Fillmore, W. 1976. Cognitive and Social Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. PhD Thesis, Stanford University.
Hakuta, K. 1974. "Prefabricated Pattern and the Emergence of Structure in Second Language Acquisition." Language Learning, 24 : 287-298.
Hatch, E. 1978. Second Language Acquisition. Newbury House.
Lyons, J. 1968. Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
Kawauchi, C. 1990. "Formulaic Speech and Creative Speech". JACET BULLETIN 19: 79-96.
Krashen, S. and Scarcella, R. 1979. "On routines and patterns in language acquisition and performance." Language Learning 28, 2 : 283-300.
Peters, A. 1977. " Language Learning Strategies: does the whole equal the sum of the parts?" Language 53: 560–73.